paragraphs [0024], [0026], [0028], [0033], [0038], [0039], [0061], [0062], [0065] and Figures 3, 5 and 7, as published by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Further, Applicant has amended claims 6 and 7, changing their dependencies. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application as originally filed.

Applicant has also inserted claims 9 to 17, submitted herewith, into the application. Support for these new claims can be found throughout the application as originally filed, for example in paragraphs [0023], [0024], [0026], [0033] and [0035] and Figures 3 and 5, as published by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 6, 7 and 8, currently on file, stating that these claims are dependent claims which describe an apparatus, but depend on claim 1 which describes a method.

Without conceding to the correctness of the Examiner's objection, but solely in order to expedite prosecution of the application, Applicant has amended claims 6 and 7, currently on file, changing their dependencies from claim 1 to claim 5. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the application as originally filed. In addition, Applicant has canceled claim 8, currently on file. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw this objection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

The Examiner stated that claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0097661 to Li *et al.*, hereinafter referred to as Li. In particular, the Examiner alleged that Li discloses a time-shifted television over IP network system, which defines each of the elements of claims 1, 2, 5 and 6, currently on file.

Without conceding to the correctness of the Examiner's objection, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 5, currently on file, in order to more clearly define the scope of protection being sought. In particular, claims 1 and 5 have been amended to additionally recite a method and apparatus, respectively, for extracting semantic content from video content, providing searchable databases storing thereon the semantic content, searching of the semantic content through manipulation of the client player, enabling selection of an enhanced feature represented by selected semantic content, and modifying the streaming of the video content in response to the enhanced feature. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the application as originally filed, for example in paragraphs [0024], [0026], [0028], [0033], [0038], [0039], [0061], [0062], [0065] and Figures 3, 5 and 7, as published by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Applicant strongly asserts that Li discloses neither extraction of semantic content, nor searching of semantic content as expressly defined in claims 1 and 5, submitted herewith. Rather, Li only discloses for example in paragraph [0075], allowing "the user to select the programs and functions he desires by navigating through an intuitively straight forward program display interface". For example, Li discloses in Figure 11 that this display interface can display a list of channels for selection, wherein upon selection of a channel the available programs can be displayed. Applicant strongly asserts that no extraction or search of semantic content, as described in claims 1 and 5 submitted herewith, is disclosed, suggested or even hinted at by Li in conjunction with navigation of a program display interface by channel or program title.

In light of the above, Applicant asserts that claims 1 and 5, submitted herewith, are novel over Li. Furthermore, as claims 2 and 6, respectively, directly depend on claim 1 or 5, these claims are equally novel over Li. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 comply with 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and respectfully requests this objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

The Examiner stated that claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0124098

to Shaw, hereinafter referred to as Shaw. The Examiner alleged that Li discloses the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 5, currently on file, but fails to disclose "wherein the audio content has been encoded for compression using prior art MP3 standards." The Examiner alleged, however, that Shaw discloses the source for streaming media being in "just about any" format, including MP3. The Examiner therefore alleged that it would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Li by specifically providing wherein the audio content has been encoded for compression using prior art MP3 standards, as taught by Shaw, for the purpose of maximizing the audio quality within given bandwidth constraints.

Based on the above arguments, Applicant asserts that claims 1 and 5, submitted herewith, upon which claims 3 and 7 directly depend, respectively, are novel. Applicant further asserts that Shaw only discloses content delivery over a network, and does not teach, suggest, or even hint at extracting or searching of semantic content as explicitly defined in claims 1 and 5, submitted herewith. Applicant therefore strongly assert that Shaw does not cure the fundamental deficiencies identified in Li, and therefore Applicant asserts that claims 3 and 7, are inventive over Li in view of Shaw. Applicant therefore submits that claims 3 and 7 comply with 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and respectfully requests this objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner stated that claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0189587 to White *et al.*, hereinafter referred to as White. The Examiner alleged that Li discloses the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 5, currently on file, but fails to disclose "wherein the video content has been pre-encoded deriving semantic content from the video to construct a searchable index of content features." The Examiner alleged, however, that White discloses in Figure 4 and in paragraph [0037] "a feature permitting the user to search a database of available videos by title, actor, director, keywords, etc." The Examiner therefore alleged that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Li by specifically providing wherein the video content has been pre-encoded deriving semantic content from the video to construct a searchable index of content features, as taught by White, for the purpose of providing the user with more search criteria allowing them to find more desirable movies and shows.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner. Applicant asserts that White only discloses for example in paragraph [0037] as noted by the Examiner, "permitting the user to search a database of available videos by title, actor, director, keywords, etc.", without specifying how this information is provided. In particular, White does not disclose, suggest, or even hint at extracting searchable semantic content from the video content, as defined in claims 4 and 8, currently on file. For example, and in support of this stance, the searchable information disclosed by White is textual only, and is directed toward searching for entire movies, not segments thereof. In contrast, according to the present invention, semantic content extracted from video content, for example as described in Figure 3, can be used to search for portions of video, and is not solely limited to textual information, as is taught by White. Applicant therefore strongly asserts that claims 4 and 8, currently on file, are inventive over Li in view of White and therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw this objection.

However, as noted above, Applicant has withdrawn claims 4 and 8, currently on file, thereby rendering the Examiner's objection thereto moot.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/ Pamela A. Baxter
Pamela A. Baxter
Attorney for Applicant
Kean Miller Hawthorne D'Armond
McCowan & Jarman, LLP
Reg. No. 59,633
Tel. No. (225) 389-3761
Telecopier (225) 388-9133
Pamela.baxter@keanmiller.com